

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Professional Services Division

June 4, 2002

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

1. The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and that consistent advice and assistance is readily available to candidates.
- That the institution provide evidence that it collaborates effectively with local school personnel in selecting school sites all along the planned fieldwork sequence and that district field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented.
- That the institution provide evidence that all remaining candidates for the Designated Subjects credential have completed requirements and that the program no longer exists.

- That the institution provide evidence of actions taken to meet all program standards less than fully met.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Adapted Physical Education Credential
 - Agricultural Specialist Credential
 - Designated Subjects Credential (only until withdrawal date)
 - Education Specialist Credentials
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean)
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean) Internship
 - Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
2. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona is required to provide evidence about actions taken to remove all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified with a revisit by Commission staff, the Accreditation Team Leader and two additional team members.
3. Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - California State Polytechnic University, Pomona be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - California State Polytechnic University, Pomona not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee on Accreditation acts upon the results of the re-visit.

Background Information

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona has a rich history as it developed from its humble beginnings as a horse ranch to university with approximately 17,800

students and 2,200 faculty and staff members. Three men played a vital role in this remarkable transformation: W. K. Kellogg, Charles B. Voorhis, and Julian McPhee.

W. K. Kellogg, known for his famous “corn flakes” had a life-long passion for Arabian horses. After purchasing 377 acres in 1925 at a cost of \$250,000, Kellogg developed the land into a world-renowned Arabian horse ranch. In fact, the first building erected contained the horse stables. In 1932, Kellogg transferred management of his Arabian Horse Ranch, including 87 horses, to the University of California. In return for a generous grant, the University agreed to keep the Arabian horses and continue the Sunday horse shows that began in 1927 and continued to draw thousands of people. Kellogg Ranch was transferred to the War Department during World War II, serving as a remount station where soldiers were trained in horsemanship. Eventually, by 1949 the ranch had grown to 813 acres and was deeded to the state of California, with the provision that the Sunday horse shows be given, a tradition that continues on the first Sunday of each month.

In 1927, Charles B. Voorhis purchased 150 acres of land near San Dimas to build a facility for deserving and underprivileged boys. Voorhis viewed this as a place where students could study an abbreviated, but intense, agricultural program. Plagued with financial problems, Voorhis was forced to close the doors of the Voorhis School for Boys only ten years after it opened. In 1938, he donated his facility as a gift to the state of California.

In 1933, Julian McPhee assumed the presidency of California Polytechnic School in San Luis Obispo. Known for his tight fiscal policy, McPhee saved the institution during the years of the Great Depression. After those bleak years, McPhee’s vision of expanding Cal Poly to Southern California was realized. In 1938, he requested the Voorhis land and the request was approved. The entire horticulture program was moved from San Luis Obispo to the new Southern California Campus and the Voorhis Unit was opened with an all-male enrollment of 110. Further expansion was halted by the onset of World War II. The southern campus was closed when the majority of its students were called to active duty.

After the war, the institution re-opened. In 1956, classes were moved to the Kellogg campus on the former Kellogg Ranch. Six programs in agriculture were offered, enrolling 550 men. In 1957, 57 agricultural majors were the first graduates of Cal Poly, Pomona. By 1959, the curriculum of the college included six degree programs in the arts and sciences and four in engineering.

In 1961 the Master Plan for Higher Education established the California State College system with its own Board of Trustees and was assigned the mission of providing instruction for undergraduate and graduate students in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions, including teaching. For the first time, 329 women were able to enroll in the student body with 2,436 men. The institution still continued to operate as a branch of the San Luis Obispo campus. In 1966, California State Polytechnic College, Kellogg-Voorhis was established as a separate institution from the San Luis Obispo school. The campus was awarded full university status in 1972 and became California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

The Teacher Preparation Program for the institution was initially housed in the Social Sciences Department, School of the Arts. In 1968, the Teacher Preparation Center was initiated. The Center was organized and managed much like other schools of the College with the Director reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, but the Center also had a number of joint appointments from the various departments offering subject matter preparation. The close working relationships with those departments is still a distinctive of the institution. In 1989, the Teacher Preparation Center was reorganized as the School of Education with separate departments of Teacher Education and Graduate and Professional Studies. The Director of the Teacher Preparation Center was named Dean of the School of Education. In 1994, the School of Education and Integrative Studies was established and consists of five interdisciplinary departments and/or programs: Interdisciplinary General Education Program, Liberal Studies, Ethnic and Women's Studies, Teacher Education, and Graduate and Professional Studies. In 1999, the School was renamed the College of Education and Integrative Studies. The Teacher Education and the Graduate and Professional Studies merged as the Department of Education. At the present time, there are approximately 698 students enrolled in credential programs and there is a full-time faculty of 25. Current enrollments in the various programs are as follows: Multiple Subjects 390, Single Subjects 197, Education Specialist 89, Adapted Physical Education 8, Designated Subjects 2, and Agricultural Specialist 12.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in September 2000. Telephone contact with the institution was made in late 2000, but a pre-visit was not scheduled. In April 2001, the staff consultant assigned to the institution left the employ of the Commission. A new staff consultant was assigned and a pre-visit to the institution was held on June 1, 2001. At that time, the Preliminary Report had not yet been completed and planning for the visit was only in its rudimentary stages. On November 15, 2001 a meeting was scheduled in Sacramento (after the Early Adopter Workshop) with the staff consultant and members of the Cal Poly faculty. At that meeting, the institution indicated that a new accreditation coordinator had been assigned who was a recent addition to the faculty. The Preliminary Report was turned in on that date. An additional pre-visit was scheduled on January 11, 2002, on the Cal Poly campus with two Commission staff consultants and members of the institutional staff. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and organizational arrangements. The team size agreement was developed in January 2002. In addition, telephone and e-mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and the accreditation coordinator. The team leader was originally selected in August 2001, but health problems necessitated the selection of a new team leader, Judith Greig, in February 2002. A pre-visit with the team leader, lead consultant and institutional representatives was held on April 9, 2002. After that meeting, a revised Preliminary Report was sent and the Institutional Self-Study Report was sent to the team. Overall, the preparations for the visit by the institution can be characterized as well behind the normal schedule for such preparations, as outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using California Program Standards for all programs. The institution was one of the Early Adopters of the SB 2042 standards and used those standards for the Multiple and Single Subject programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Education and Integrative Studies and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twelve consisting of the Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of two members, an Elementary and Education Specialist Cluster of five members, and a Secondary and Other Credential Cluster of four members. In addition, a specially trained reviewer was added to team to review the implementation of the reading standard for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the two program clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, May 5. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team to provide training on the use of the SB 2042 standards and to review roles and responsibilities of team members. This meeting was followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 6-7, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution developed an interview schedule and team members conducted group and individual interviews and reviewed documentation in the two days devoted to collection of data. There was extensive consultation among the

members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings.

On Tuesday morning, the team leader and staff consultants met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and to request additional information that was being sought. The institution was able to present additional information to the team by the end of the day on Tuesday.

Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During these work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team determined that one Common Standard was Not Met, five Common Standards were Met Minimally and two Common Standards were fully met.

For each separate program area, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Standard Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met" for each program standard. In the case of the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs using the SB 2042 standards, the team had the decision options of "Standard Met," "Standard Met with Concerns," or "Standard Not Met." The team then prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. The team determined that for the Multiple Subject Credential all program standards were fully met with the exception of two standards that were met with concerns and three standards that were not met. For the Single Subject Credential all program standards were fully met with the exception of four standards that were met with concerns. For the Education Specialist Credential, Level I, all program standards were fully met except for two standards that were met minimally. For the Education Specialist Credential, Level II, the Adapted Physical Education program and the Agricultural Specialist Credential, all program standards were fully met. For the Designated Subjects Credential, the team was not able to make a determination about the standards because the self-study report did not appropriately address the standards. Since the program is being withdrawn, the team felt that it was a moot point.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Recommendations by the Team

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Tuesday evening and made a tentative accreditation recommendation. After the report was finished, the entire team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team determined that only two Common Standards were fully met, and that there were deficiencies in some program areas. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation recommendation for the institution on the basis of its findings. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." The team was in agreement that stipulations were in order and that they were either "substantive" or "probationary." After consultation with the *Accreditation Handbook* and thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**" based on its observation that the deficiencies identified impinged on the institution's ability to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness, but did not prevent that delivery. The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Dates of Visit: May 5-8, 2002

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and that consistent advice and assistance is readily available to candidates.
- That the institution provide evidence that it collaborates effectively with local school personnel in selecting school sites all along the planned fieldwork sequence and that district field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented.
- That the institution provide evidence that all remaining candidates for the Designated Subjects credential have completed requirements and that the program no longer exists.
- That the institution provide evidence of actions taken to meet all program standards less than fully met.

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards—The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. Only two standards, Standard 2 Resources and Standard 3 Faculty, were judged to have been fully met. Three standards, Standard 4 Evaluation,

Standard 5 Admission, and Standard 7 School Collaboration, were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns. Two standards, Standard 1 Educational Leadership and Standard 8 District Field Supervisors, were judged to have been met minimally with quantitative concerns. One standard, Standard 6 Advice and Assistance, was judged to have been not met. These judgments were based on the fact that candidates are completely frustrated in their attempts to understand the requirements of the programs, including the criteria for admission, and receive advice and assistance. In addition there is a significant void in leadership: clear and unified vision for the preparation of teachers is missing; management is fragmented and does not resolve problems in an effective and timely way; and lines of authority and responsibility are unclear. No system is in place to ensure that master teachers and district support providers are carefully selected, trained, and oriented. Although candidates are well supported in seeking field placements for student teaching, there is little collaboration with students or local schools in selecting placements for earlier field experiences. Numerous evaluative tools are in place; however, there is neither evidence that the information gained is used to improve the program nor that a systematic and comprehensive program is in place to include all stakeholders in program design and evaluation activities.

2. Program Standards – Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the cluster leaders, with additional clarification as needed from the cluster members. Following the initial presentation, the team discussed each program area and particularly each standard that was less than fully met. Generally the candidates who complete the professional programs are judged by professionals in the field to be well prepared to teach.

The Multiple Subject Programs, including Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD and Multiple Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of Standards 1 and 16, which were met with concerns, and Standards 2, 7A, and 18, which were not met. The design and sequence of the program do not adequately account for the needs and schedules of intern teachers. Collaboration with local school personnel, particularly with respect to the design of the program and field placements, is not evidenced. There is not programmatic, systematic assurance that the criteria for the selection of field placements, student teaching placements, and master teachers are used and enforced; this includes settings where comprehensive, systematic beginning reading instruction is taught.

The Single Subject Programs, including Single Subject CLAD and Single Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of Standards 1, 2, 7B, and 16, which were met with concerns. The concerns were similar to those evidenced in the Multiple Subject Programs; however, the significant and important collaboration of the content area faculty and their connections in local schools, lessened the degree of concern.

The Educational Specialist Level I program standards are fully met, with the exception of standards 9 and 23, which were met minimally. The design and curriculum of the Integrated Program, particularly in light of the changes proposed in the Multiple Subject Program in response to the 2042 standards, appear to provide inadequate opportunity for candidates to acquire the specialized knowledge necessary.

All standards for the Educational Specialist Level II Program are fully met.

All standards for the Adaptive PE Program are fully met.

All standards for Agricultural Specialist are fully met.

The Designated Subjects Credential Program has been withdrawn. All remaining candidates will have written plans for completion, at the latest by the end of Fall Quarter, 2002.

3. Overall Recommendation – The decision to recommend Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based in part on team consensus that only two Common Standards were fully met. Significant deficiencies were noted, and the issues identified impinge on the ability to deliver effective programs. Despite these numerous and significant impediments, the core programs and teaching and learning interactions were generally found to be of good quality and effectiveness; consistent reports from employers indicated that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the recommendation Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.

Team Leader: **Judith Greig**
Notre Dame de Namur University

Common Standards Cluster:

Stacie Curry, Cluster Leader
Riverdale Unified School District

Carl Brown
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Elementary and Education Specialist Cluster:

Reyes Quezada, Cluster Leader
University of San Diego

Candace Kaye
California State University, Long Beach

Lucy Vezutto
Orange County Department of Education

Margaret Parker
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Mary Male
San Jose State University

Carol Adams
Lompoc Unified School District

Secondary and Other Program Cluster:

Chris Hopper, Cluster Leader
Humboldt State University

Carolyn Csongradi
Palo Alto Unified School District

Bill Kellogg
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Marilyn Cothran
Simi Valley Unified School District

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 College Annual Report
 College Budget Plan

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Elem. & Educ. Specialist	Secondary & Other Programs	TOTAL
Program Faculty	5	10	34	37	86
Institutional Administration	10	2		4	16
Candidates	26	15	180	71	292
Graduates		5	47	16	68
Employers of Graduates			6	4	10
Supervising Practitioners	1		20	7	28
Advisors			3	8	11
School Administrators		7	8	11	26
Credential Analysts and Staff		1	5	4	10
Advisory Committee		3	2	14	19
TOTAL					566

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Common Standards

Standard 1 Education Leadership

Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

The College of Education and Integrative Studies is organized with and dean, associate dean and program faculty in the Departments of Education, Ethnic and Women's Studies, Liberal Studies, and Interdisciplinary General Education. Single subject teacher educators from other colleges collaborate with faculty in the Education Department to offer the single subject credential programs.

Credential program faculty have been actively involved in the creation, delivery and management of programs. For example, extensive consideration was given by faculty to developing the plan to meet 2042 standards. There is a written statement of mission for the Education Department in the documentation. The Dean has supported new hires, including a single subject coordinator, and has encouraged advances in educational technology. The College is well represented on campus, in the community, and contributes to the college's recognition throughout the state and in the profession.

Reviews of credential and program documents and interviews with faculty, students and practitioners reveal, however, the lack of a carefully articulated and widely shared vision for professional education across programs and at each level of the college's structure. Moreover, there is a perceived lack of clarity regarding which responsibilities adhere to the dean's office, the associate dean's office and which are delegated to the Education Department Chair and thence to the various program coordinators and committees. For example, while a few faculty share important organizational and programmatic duties in the multiple subject program, there is confusion as to who serves as program coordinator, with the department chair, the placement coordinator, various faculty advisors being identified in turn as serving that role by various interviewees who would be expected to be in a position to know. As this example may help illustrate, organizational vagueness has had its consequences: problems to be resolved seem sometimes to follow an organizational structural process but at other times to await ad hoc solutions by enterprising individuals. Many interviewees experienced disjuncture and confusion as to roles, requirements, and lines of authority for faculty, staff and students while each group negotiated as it might in the context of perceived disorganization toward its own program or professional goals.

Strengths

None additional noted

Concerns

None additional noted

Standard 2 Resources

Standard Met

A budget and planning Advisory Committee is responsible for the development, implementation and monitoring of the College annual budget. Each Department submits requests for supplemental funding based upon the department priority. Following development of College and Department priorities for supplemental budget requests, each department develops a proposed budget plan based upon proposed/anticipated new funds as well as existing funds. The Dean then proposes a balanced budget plan. Following the University budget allocation to the College, an operating budget is established.

Increasing faculty/student ratios and extensive demands on faculty time for university and community service or coordination/supervision activities at school sites are apparent. From the evidence presented, it seems that enrollment pressures have stretched even further the ability of full time faculty to both offer needed sections and fulfill related professional commitments.

Library and technology resources appear equitable, and adequate. The multi media collections, journals, online access and books serving students in all credential programs are suitable to the needs of the academic programs they serve.

The College of Education has limited and disconnected space for faculty offices and classrooms. Due to space limitations the Student Services Center and many faculty offices are housed away from most of the college and departmental office, causing students to have to make several stops in order to take care of business.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

The placement of the Student Services Center does not allow for easy access by students.

Standard 3 Faculty

Standard Met

The Cal Poly Pomona Education Department can boast a talented and dedicated faculty and a quality group of part-time faculty and field supervisors. Also, effective subject matter faculty in academic departments across campus add strength to the quality instruction widely praised by the students we interviewed.

Program documents and interviews identify clearly a faculty well qualified in their disciplines and sensitive to issues of diversity. Time and again students and graduates praised the education and content area faculty for skillful teaching, caring dispositions, and enthusiasm for students' success. Faculty have been given recognition for good teaching and many are known for scholarly attainment and/or active contributions to the profession in positions of importance on and off campus. New faculty are contributing organizationally and professionally at an impressive level.

With the encouragement and guidance of the University administration, faculty committees have conducted successful searches, bringing on board new faculty in a number of areas vital to the

department's mission as it moves into the 2042 era. Newly hired faculty are supported by the university with adequate first-year release time, office space, computers, and with the opportunity to apply for professional development grants. A balance between teaching, service and professional development has been established for all faculty as appropriate to their academic rank.

While much more could be done to include part-time faculty in the department's professional life, these adjunct members are highly regarded by their full-time colleagues, and rightly so, because they are making significant contributions to credential programs delivery.

Almost without exception, field supervisors and the department's approach to field supervisor selection and assignment receives high marks from field students, whether emergency permit holders, interns, or traditional student teachers. Field supervisors are giving students effective instruction and support.

Strengths:

As noted above.

Concerns:

The college and department should consider how to extend the established university support for new faculty down to the unit levels.

The college and department should continue to strengthen its efforts to engage part time faculty in ongoing design and evaluation activities.

Standard 4 Evaluation

**Standard Met Minimally
With Qualitative Concerns**

The College of Education does not regularly involve program participants, graduates, employers, and local practitioners in evaluation of the quality of credential programs. The evidence found was not systematically collected across all programs with any regularity or consistency. The available evaluation data were not found to be regularly used by faculty to improve the quality of programs. For example, exit surveys are touted as a key evaluative tool in the programs and are required of students before they complete the credential application process; however, the exit survey tool is viewed as flawed by involved parties and is not interpreted or used for program improvement.

Local practitioners have not been involved in the design of the 2042 standards. The University designed these with little to no input from participants outside of the University.

The CSU Chancellors survey was not used as evidence of program effectiveness. The survey has not been analyzed or interpreted and has not been used to make suggestions for program improvements.

Some opportunities were provided for professional practitioners to become involved in the evaluation process, but these were generally carried out through Advisory Committees, informal meetings with Field Supervisors, and personal communications with specific faculty members.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

None noted

Standard 5 Admission**Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns**

The Department has established admissions criteria and procedures that include multiple measures and Commission-adopted admission requirements. These are published and available at the Student Services Office and are introduced and explained to prospective applicants at regularly scheduled orientation sessions. However, incorrect information is included in materials made available to students. For example, the Teacher Education brochure is out of date in a number of respects, including the failure to take into account that Executive Order 758 superceded 547 over a year ago, establishing common admission standards and GPA requirements for all CSU credential programs.

Interviewees provided conflicting reports on how the faculty selection committees functioned, and thus it was not possible for the team to determine well this part of the admissions process is functioning.

Still, the credential analysts do have a rigorous process in place for their part of the selection work, and they have ready, clear answers to admissions criteria questions.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

There is an apparent need for an updated and cohesive approach to the admissions process where faculty, staff and advisors are united as to information provided and procedures followed.

Standard 6 Advice and Assistance

Standard Not Met

Information regarding programs and credential requirements are provided in written format and group orientations. However, interviews with students indicated that the effectiveness of the advisement process needs overhauling. Many students indicated that the primary source for advisement was the office of the Credential Analyst; they would use the reports provided by the Credential Analyst to plan future coursework. Other students reported that they would often rely on other students and the department secretary for advisement information.

The Student Services Center assists students and prospective students regarding credential program requirements. Student records for credential programs are housed in the Student Services Center; most students' information has to be compiled and retrieved by hand.

In spite of the Student Services Center resources, students consistently commented that they often received misinformation, incorrect information, and inconsistent information in regard to repeated queries about the requirements necessary for admission to and completion of the credential program.

The Student Service Center provides limited access for the majority of the students in the credential programs. A large number of the students attend classes during the evening after the Student Services Center has closed for the day.

However, documents and interviews pointed to some discrepancies between levels of knowledge about admissions criteria held by credential analysts and those conducting the orientations. Applicants were sometimes left with uncertainty about requirements and procedures because different levels of information were provided by analysts, orientation providers and personnel working the Services front desk

Most students felt the faculty was willing to entertain questions in regard to credential requirements before and after classes. Students felt that speaking with faculty prior to and after class was more beneficial than a formal advisement session.

Strengths

The Credential Analysts are knowledgeable and provide information about credential requirements to students and faculty. There appears to be positive communication in regard to credential requirements between the Credential Analyst and faculty members.

When students interact with faculty on advisement issues the faculty is willing and knowledgeable of program goals and requirements.

The move to centralized advisement in the Student Services Center appears to be a healthy beginning in solving the serious advisement problems.

Concerns

Student interviews indicated that misinformation about program requirements were often given by student employees who work in the Students Services Center.

Student interviews indicated that several courses were changed without student notification and these changes affected their status. Students are unaware of catalog rights and the grievance

procedures. Many students stated that the lack of information and misinformation was characterized as a “Cal Poly thing.”

Standard 7 School Collaboration

Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns

The University participates with many school districts to place students for field experience, student teaching and internships. These collaborations also include using local district personnel as adjunct faculty to provide practical, real life experiences for credential candidates.

The Service Learning Center regularly coordinates activities with credential candidates and local schools. Some of these activities include “The Gift of Math” and Reading Buddy Programs.

Several faculty fieldwork supervisors plan real life experiences for their students at local school sites. Some of these real life experiences include teaching reading at the juvenile correction facility, and planning and teaching units at local elementary schools.

The field work supervisors assigned to candidates by the University are knowledgeable of the teaching profession and well equipped to assist student teachers and interns. The University works closely with district personnel to select school sites for student teachers.

However, the University does not consistently coordinate or support early fieldwork experiences. Student interviews indicated that most students have to seek out early field experiences on their own with no assistance from the University.

The University faces continual difficulties with BCLAD placements. There is a lack of qualified personnel to supervise the BCLAD candidates.

Strengths

Interviews with students indicated a positive and useful field supervision of the student teaching and intern experience. Students stated feedback received from fieldwork supervisors was beneficial and guided them toward improvement. Students reported fieldwork supervisors were consistent in their visits and feedback.

Concerns

Intern MOU’s do not all address all Education Code requirements. The MOU includes minimal requirements and commitments for all parties involved in the intern processes.

Standard 8 Field Supervisors

Standard Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

Although the programs have articulated selection criteria for district field supervisors, there is no system in place to ensure that the criteria are actually used in the selection process.

There is no evidence of assurance that district field supervisors are either oriented or trained.

There is a lack of evidence of a consistent, uniform procedure for evaluating district supervisors. There is also a lack of evidence for support of district field supervisors and recognition for outstanding service.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

Interviews with students indicated that district field supervisors are inconsistent in levels of support. Many districts assigned supervising teachers simply “Check In” with the intern. In some cases the designated field supervisor is in the district office and has no regular contact with the students.

In some cases, District Field Supervisors were not aware they were considered a Field Supervisor.

Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean) Credential and Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject Programs except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design - Met with Concerns

There was an overriding concern with the response to Element C. There was a lack of an interrelated cohesive set of learning experiences for each teacher candidate. The team found strong evidence of a gap between document evidence of curriculum design and redundant interpretation in presentation in coursework as indicated by a preponderance of candidate interviews. Additionally, the sequencing of the courses did not meet the needs of the intern teachers, which are a majority of the program participants.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program - Not Met

There is no convincing evidence that Elements A, B, C, and F were addressed.

Element A. No strong evidence exists to describe school district partnerships or collaborative dialogue related to the program design and how it meets the needs of the school candidates, especially the employed intern teachers. The self-study document, the school administrator interviews, and the review of the two intern advisory council agendas substantiate this finding.

Element B & C. There was no evidence of joint efforts or the responsiveness of the education faculty to encourage multiple perspectives of the respective members in the advisory council process. The education faculty redesigned the program and its policies without clear evidence of input from school district personnel.

Element F. There was no mention in the self-study document of the establishment of collaborative partnerships with the sponsors of professional induction programs, including the articulation of the contents of the professional teacher preparation program and the induction program. Facilitating transitions for prospective and beginning teachers was not addressed.

Standard 7a: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts - Not Met

Elements H and J are partially addressed. Element I is not addressed. Field experiences and student teaching assignments are inconsistently designed to move theory into practice or to provide effective models of comprehensive beginning reading programs.

Element H. Student teaching assignments are not designed to establish cohesive connections between reading methods coursework and participation in effective reading instruction. There are no required lesson observations during student teaching. Candidates are provided little consistent feedback on their ability to deliver a comprehensive, systematic reading program for grades K-8.

Element I. The institution provided no evidence that each candidate has extended experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught.

Element J. Criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers include a listing of reading-language arts knowledge, however there is no collaboration between the university and the districts to assure that teachers selected actually model current reading practices.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors - Met with Concerns

Element A. The team's concern is related to the fieldwork experience, which is connected to many of the credential courses. All candidates interviewed stated that they are asked to select their own sites for the 20 to 30 hours of fieldwork for each relevant course. As stated in the standard, there was no evidence of pre-selected school sites where the state-adopted academic core curriculum is effectively implemented.

Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program - Not Met

Element G. There was no evidence of frequent consultation with school administrators in planning pedagogical assignments and tasks in both program courses and fieldwork.

Strengths

Many program candidates, including intern teachers, commented on the high level of commitment and accessibility of university supervisors.

Many program candidates reported on the high level of content expertise and effective instructional ability of program faculty, including modeling of effective, reflective practices and linking of theory with these practices.

The evidence including syllabi, interviews of candidates, graduates, and faculty clearly indicates attention to provision of opportunities to examine and reflect on diversity issues and application of learning in classroom practice.

Candidates are given the opportunities and resources to develop personal competency in computer-based technology in an infused model across the curriculum.

The evidence revealed that the curriculum addressed state content standards and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession through a variety of interactive instructional and learning experiences.

Reading-language arts faculty are knowledgeable and enthusiastic. They present a wide range of reading strategies that enable candidates to see the connections between theory and practice across grades K-8.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

**Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Credential and
Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship Credential**

Findings on Standards

This institution has chosen to respond as an early adopter of 2042 Standards. After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met with the exception of Standard 1 Program Design, Standard 2 Collaboration in Governing the Program, Standard 7 Preparation to Teach Reading – Language Arts, and Standard 16 Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors, which are *met with concerns*.

Standard 1 Program Design – Met with Concerns

Element (a) The majority of candidates are already in full-time teaching positions but the course sequence better serves the needs of a more traditional student teacher.

Element (b) Single subject content and multiple subject content are not consistently separated where appropriate. For example the Student Teaching Handbook integrates multiple and single subject candidate information, and in a mixed subject class, Positive Classroom Interventions, the instructor discusses strategies for managing elementary students. The team notes that the single subject coordinator is in the process of developing a separate handbook for single subject candidates.

Standard 2 Collaboration in Governing the Program – Met with Concerns

Element (c) Based on documents and interviews, the team determined that the review of program practices by school district personnel was inconsistent.

Element (e) With the exception of the satellite internship program housed at the Robert-Hardy Staff Development Center in the Ontario-Montclair School District, the team saw no evidence that the program-based fieldwork component offered opportunities for purposeful involvement in collaborative partnerships for the design and delivery of programs by parent and community organizations, county offices of education, educational research centers, business representatives, and teachers' bargaining agents.

Standard 7B Preparation to Teach Reading Language Arts – Met with Concerns

Element (c) Program candidates receive inconsistent instruction and experience in using diagnostic assessment strategies for individualized content-based reading instruction. In addition, candidates have few experiences in teaching systematic, explicit skills that promote fluent reading.

Element (d) Both reading and language arts courses include the study of phonological, morphological structures of the English language at a superficial level.

Elements (f)&(g) Field experiences and student teaching assignments provide some opportunities for application of course content. However, the opportunities are inconsistent and candidates receive little feedback from field supervisors or cooperating teachers on their abilities to provide effective reading instruction.

Standard 16 Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Supervisor Qualifications – Met with Concerns

Element (a) Based on documents and interviews, the team found no evidence that pre-selected sites effectively implemented state-adopted academic core curriculum. Candidates must locate

their own classes to observe at school sites to complete course fieldwork requirements (TED 401, 402, 446, 447).

Element (c) With the exception of the agriculture program, based on interviews, the team could not determine whether program sponsors and school-site representatives consistently followed criteria and procedures for master teacher selection.

Element (e) With the exception of the agriculture single subject program, the team found no evidence that program sponsors and cooperating school administrators enable supervising teachers to complete, as needed, planned professional training to develop their understanding of the developmental progression of beginning teachers.

Strengths

The team found that the single subject credential program was well-focused and does an excellent job of preparing practioners to work in today's diverse classrooms. The program's faculty and staff place an equal emphasis on professional preparation and academic preparation for its candidates.

Some of the program's notable strengths include:

- A new faculty position for the single subject coordinator
- The education – related expertise of the subject matter faculty
- The quality of student teacher supervision by subject matter faculty
- The education faculty's decision to participate in the early adoption of 2042 standards
- The highly qualified reading language arts faculty who effectively model and demonstrate content area strategies for a wide range of learners. Two reading language arts courses are required providing candidates with an in-depth understanding of the writing process and its interrelationship with the reading process.

Concerns

- The number of candidates who select a traditional student teacher program has greatly diminished over the past five years. Now many candidates opt for full, paid teaching assignments early in their post graduate experience. Those candidates say that they have a great need for survival skills and practical knowledge which is not addressed in the present course sequence.
- Single subject candidates may start their supervised teaching block only at the beginning of winter quarter. If a required pre-requisite class is not available in the fall quarter, the candidates may have to wait until the next year to start their student teaching.
- Many candidates expressed confusion about credential requirements and appropriate course selections. They provided numerous examples of conflicting advice between subject matter and education faculty. Course numbers and units changed without adequate student notification. As a result, some single subject students had to take additional courses and pay extra fees.

Preliminary Education Specialist Credential – Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe including Internship

Findings on Standards

After review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, and faculty, the team determined that all the program standards for the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I preliminary credential are met, except for the following:

Standard 9 – Program Design, Rationale and Coordination - *Minimally met with quantitative concerns*

Finding: The program design (Standard 9), in which students in mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities participate along with multiple subjects students in methods/curriculum courses, has the potential to offer effective preparation for both groups in the general education curriculum, along with adaptations, modifications, accommodations, and strategies to meet the needs of K-8 students with disabilities. However, reports from graduates in both general and special education report that, with few exceptions, the special education issues are not addressed within the general education courses. Review of the course syllabi in 4 of the 8 courses finds no mention of special education or disabilities in the course objectives, no assigned readings on this target group, and no assignments or fieldwork. Review of 21 faculty vita from faculty teaching in relevant courses show that only 5 document any credential or professional experience in the field of special education.

The team was unable to find any evidence that students who are preparing to teach high school special education receive any preparation in frameworks and curriculum appropriate for grades 9-12. Assignments and course activities are directed primarily to the K-8 general education population. Students reported that coursework dedicated to Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities is of high quality but the number of courses is limited.

Standard 23 (Mild/Moderate): Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction - *Minimally met with quantitative concerns*

Finding: Although the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credentials are K-12 basic teaching credentials, only one course (TED 555) is dedicated specifically to preparing candidates for serving these students, and this course purports to prepare educators across the two credentials for assessment and evaluation of students, even though the needs and skills for each of the disability area are quite different.. No specific coursework in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction (Standard 23, Mild/Moderate) is offered. A specific curriculum course (TED 556) is offered for students in the Moderate/Severe Program.

Strengths

Candidates and graduates report that the faculty is a significant strength of the program. Both general and special education students and graduates note that the TED 551, Special Populations, is particularly strong in providing information about disabilities. The program has an ongoing affiliation with Camp Afflerbaugh-Paige which is an L.A. County juvenile correction facility.

Students in the Level I program work as tutors during an introductory course at the university. This an excellent example of collaboration with community agencies, hands on experience for students in the beginning of the Level I program and community service learning.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted

Professional Education Specialist Credential – Mild Moderate, Moderate/Severe

Findings on Standards

After review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, and faculty, the team determined that all the program standards for the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level II credential are met.

Strengths

Students note that the technology emphasis of both Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe programs is excellent, with equipment and software to demonstrate assistive technology.

Concerns

Students reported that they were unaware of the Level II requirement.

Level I credential course overview does not mention Level II, and the Policy Handbook does not refer to the relationship of Level I to Level II.

Students who attended another university for Level I and entered Cal Poly-Pomona for Level II reported that they did not get consistent advice on Level II requirements.

Adapted Physical Education

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, master teachers, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Strengths

Students and graduates report that the program provides strong preparation for teaching adapted physical education. In particular, students and graduates reported that they were provided with a broad range of field experiences throughout their program.

The on-campus Motor Development Clinic provides opportunities for students to gain practical experiences planning and delivering programs for children and youth with disabilities. In this clinic students are guided through developmental teaching sequences in physical education for children with disabilities.

Graduates report that their professional preparation has enabled them to teach effectively. Principals noted the strong teaching performances by graduates. Graduates are identified as being very knowledgeable in special education procedures.

The portfolio developed by each candidate represents a comprehensive assessment process and provides candidates with an excellent teaching resource.

Concerns

None Noted.

Designated Subjects Credential

Findings on Standards

Because the institution has only recently withdrawn the program, the program was still required be included in the accreditation visit. The institution did not provide a response to the program standards, for the visit. In addition, even with repeated requests, only one candidate and no graduates of the Designated Subjects Program were made available for interviews. The meager information provided by the institution made review of this program very difficult. The decision to withdraw the program is certainly the appropriate decision. The program appears to have been completely controlled by a single faculty member, housed in the College of Agriculture, who abruptly left the institution. Given the large number of credential recommendations generated in this program, the lack of knowledge about the program, lack of coordinated effort and support for the program represents a serious problem for the institution.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

Agricultural Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and master teachers, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Strengths

The team found that the Agricultural Specialist program has a systematic, well-organized program of teacher credentialing, which is responsive to the needs of candidates and the teaching profession. A need for the program has been clearly demonstrated in the university service area. Cal Poly Pomona has the only Agricultural Specialist credential program in Southern California.

Some of the program's notable strengths include:

- A program coordinator that provides accurate and timely advice to candidates.
- Careful selection and effective criteria are developed for the selection of Master Teachers. Additionally, Master Teachers undergo training and orientation to assure for a successful student teaching experience.
- The program coordinator was praised for his frequent and effective student teacher visitations.

Concerns

None noted.

Professional Comments

Common Standards

District Field Supervisors are in need of a well planned orientation, ongoing regular meetings and support, and end of quarter evaluation of performance as a District Field Supervisor.

The team suggests that the institution should develop a handbook specifically designed for the District Field Supervisor for students who are interns or student teachers. This handbook needs to clearly outline the responsibilities of the supervising teacher, the goals of the student teaching program, the process for evaluating the student teacher/intern, and the process for conflict resolution if needed.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

It is recommended that Field Supervisors monitor and assess the implementation of instructional practices that promote English language development and Specially Designed Academic Instructional Strategies (ELD & SDAIE) in order to better serve English Language Learners.

BCLAD candidates felt a need for more course/s content to be taught in the primary language in order to enhance their oral and written competency in Spanish.

Intern teachers' fieldwork connected with coursework can be better designed to address their specific needs as employed teachers. Fieldwork can be designed to be more relevant to the Intern teachers as well as provide for a diverse set of experiences.

Single Subject Credential Program

It is recommended that Field Supervisors monitor and assess the implementation of instructional practices that promote English language development and Specially Designed Academic Instructional Strategies (ELD & SDAIE) in order to better serve English Language Learners.

BCLAD candidates felt a need for more course/s content to be taught in the primary language in order to enhance their oral and written competency in Spanish.

Intern teachers' fieldwork connected with coursework can be better designed to address their specific needs as employed teachers. Fieldwork can be designed to be more relevant to the Intern teachers as well as provide for a diverse set of experiences.

Education Specialist

Program faculty raised concern that with the changes to the Multiple Subject Program in response to the SB 2042 standards, the integrated design will no longer be feasible or effective.

Intern teachers' fieldwork connected with coursework can be better designed to address their specific needs as employed teachers. Fieldwork can be designed to be more relevant to the Intern teachers as well as provide for a diverse set of experiences.

.